

# **Update on the Work of the Administrative Services Credential Writing Panel Activities February 2013**

## **Overview of this Report**

This agenda item provides an update on the activities of the writing panel to date.

## **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item.

## **Background**

In August 2012, the Commission granted approval for a small writing panel to be convened for the purpose of reviewing, updating, and writing Administrative Services Credential program standards for both preliminary and clear credential programs (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-08/2012-08-4E.pdf>). The membership of the selected panel can be found in Appendix A.

Further, in December 2012, the Commission took action to require the development of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) to serve as the expedited examination route to the preliminary administrative services credential, as permitted by statute, when the current examination contract for this purpose expires in October 2014 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-12/2012-12-4E.pdf>). The work of developing content specifications and performance expectations for the new performance assessment was given to the current Administrative Services Credential (ASC) Standards Writing Panel that has been meeting to update the Administrative Services program standards.

To date, the ASC Writing Panel had held two face-to-face meetings and one teleconference. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss and analyze a variety of administrator preparation standards, to help inform the development of the next iteration of California's Administrative Services Credential standards. Draft sets of California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) and California Administrator Content Expectations were developed and presented to the Commission at their January 31-February 1 meeting for confirmation that the panel was indeed going in a direction that the Commission felt was appropriate. That agenda item can be found in Appendix B. Staff will provide an oral update to the COA at its February meeting summarizing the discussion of the Commission on this topic.

## **Next Steps**

### ***CAPEs and Content Expectations***

Following Commission review of the draft Content Expectations, and subsequent to Commission direction to proceed to a field review of the CAPEs and the Content Expectations, field surveys will be developed and made available to stakeholders. Feedback from the field will be used to modify, as appropriate the CAPEs and Content Expectations.

### ***ASC Program Standards***

As the Performance Expectations and Content Expectations are finalized, the ASC Writing Panel will turn their attention to the writing of the program standards. Existing standards will be

reviewed and revised for the preliminary credential and new induction standards will be written for the clear program. June continues to be the target date for these standards to be drafted.

**Appendix A**  
**The ASC Writing Panel Membership**

<b>Panel Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Mike Bossi	Director of Leadership Coaching at ACSA, Sacramento Office
Danette Brown	Teacher on Special Assignment La Habra City Schools/CTA Representative
Rebecca Cheung	Academic Coordinator at UC Berkeley
Steve Davis	Faculty Member in Doctoral Studies California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Karen Kearney	Director, Leadership Initiative West Ed
Carol Leighty	Interim Dean at Point Loma Nazarene University
Carlye Olsen	Director of Accountability, Professional Development, Educational Technology, Curriculum and Instructional Materials Whittier Union High School District
Olivia Sosa	Director, Multilingual Education at San Joaquin County Office of Education

## **Appendix B**

### **Commission Agenda Item on California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPES) and California Administrator Content Expectations January 31-February 1**

# 4D

## Information/Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### **Draft California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs), Draft California Administrator Content Expectations, and Options for the Development of the Administrator Performance Assessment**

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents draft *California Administrator Performance Assessment Expectations* (CAPEs) and draft California Administrator Content Expectations for initial Commission review. The CAPEs describe the performance expectations for candidates just ready to begin practice as a California school administrator. The Content Expectations describe the underlying content knowledge needed by the administrative services candidate to successfully meet the performance expectations. Part II of the item addresses options for proceeding with the development of the Administrator Performance Assessment (APA).

**Policy Question:** Do the CAPEs and the Content Expectations reflect Commission expectations and priorities for the knowledge and competencies expected of beginning administrator candidates? Does the Commission wish to proceed with the further development and field review of the CAPEs and the Content Expectations? How would the Commission prefer to proceed with the development of the APA?

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission: (a) review the draft CAPEs Content Expectations and indicate whether they meet Commission expectations and are in preferred priority order, (b) indicate if the CAPEs and Content Expectations should proceed to the field review process, and (c) indicate how the development of the APA should proceed.

**Presenter:** Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division

#### **Strategic Plan Goal**

##### ***I. Educator Quality***

- ◆ Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners

January-February 2013

---

# **Draft *California Administrator Performance Expectations* (CAPEs), Draft California Administrator Content Expectations, and Options for the Development of the Administrator Performance Assessment**

---

## **Introduction**

This three-part agenda item presents draft *California Administrator Performance Expectations*. Parts I and II present the (CAPEs) and underlying Administrator Content Expectations for initial Commission review. Parallel to the role of the *California Teaching Performance Expectations* for teachers, the CAPEs describe the minimum competencies expected of candidates just ready to begin professional practice as a California school administrator. The CAPEs and the Content Expectations will serve as the basis for the development of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) for preliminary administrative services candidates, in the same manner as the TPEs served as the basis for the development of the Teaching Performance Assessment for teacher candidates. Part III of the item provides options for the development of the APA.

## **Background**

In December 2012, the Commission took action to require the development of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) to serve as the statutorily-permitted expedited examination route to the preliminary administrative services credential when the current examination contract for this purpose expires in October 2014 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-12/2012-12-4E.pdf>). The work of developing content specifications and performance expectations for the new performance assessment was given to the current Administrative Services Credential (ASC) Standards Writing Team (Appendix C) that has been meeting to update the Administrative Services program standards.

The draft CAPEs and the draft Content Expectations represent the outcome of two Administrative Services Standards writing group meetings' worth of discussion and analysis of a variety of administrator preparation standards, including but not limited to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL), the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, and the National Board standards.

## **Part I: Overview of the *California Administrator Performance Expectations***

The CAPEs were developed to be parallel in structure and in format to the TPEs. The CAPEs were structured to reflect an operational perspective on the leadership job role and responsibilities of a California public school administrator, and are arranged in a possible order of priority or emphasis.

### ***Categories of the CAPEs***

The six broad categories of the CAPEs are:

**A. Visionary Leadership** (Four CAPEs)

This category addresses the candidate's actionable vision of teaching and learning in the context of a given school and local education agency, and his/her ability to lead others collaboratively and ethically in implementing the vision.

**B. Instructional Leadership** (Four CAPEs)

This category addresses the candidate's knowledge of California's student academic content standards; appropriate and effective curriculum, instructional, and assessment practices; and the candidate's ability to analyze classroom instruction and provide focused, constructive feedback to teachers to improve teaching and learning for all students.

**C. School Improvement Leadership** (Four CAPEs)

This category addresses the candidate's knowledge and implementation of appropriate and effective school improvement theories and practices, as well as his/her ability to lead others in continuous improvement efforts based on student outcomes data.

**D. Professional Growth and Development Leadership** (Three CAPEs)

This category addresses the candidate's ability to model professional growth and development as well as to identify and provide focused professional growth and development opportunities for others to help achieve the school's vision and goals.

**E. Systems Leadership** (Three CAPEs)

This category addresses the candidate's ability to understand and manage effectively the variety of interconnected systems that affect and impact the school's ability to achieve its vision and goals.

**F. Community Leadership** (Two CAPEs)

This category addresses the candidate's ability to advocate publicly for the school, its successes and its needs, with a broad range of audiences, and to involve parents, the community, and others in helping achieve the school's vision and goals.

The CAPE categories are arranged in a possible priority order of emphasis for purposes of performance assessment development, pending Commission input regarding priority ordering of the CAPEs. For the Performance Assessment, it is essential that the Commission identify if all of the CAPEs should be assessed by the Performance Assessment, if all the CAPEs are assessed should they have equal weight in the assessment, or should a subset of the CAPEs be measured by the Performance Assessment. Each of these six categories organizes the proposed CAPEs that address the topical heading.

## **The Draft California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs)**

### **A. Visionary Leadership**

1. Developing and Articulating a Vision of Teaching and Learning for the School Consistent With the Local Education Agency's Overall Vision and Goals (*Note: as used throughout this document, "Local Education Agency (LEA)" refers to all educational entities responsible for providing K-12 public education, such as local school districts, county offices of education, and others*)
2. Developing a Shared Commitment to the Vision Among All Members of the School Community
3. Leading by Example to Promote Implementation of the Vision
4. Sharing Leadership with Others in the School Community to Help Accomplish the Vision

### **B. Instructional Leadership**

5. Promoting Implementation of K-12 Standards, Pedagogical Skills, and Student Assessments for Content Instruction
6. Evaluating, Analyzing, and Providing Feedback on the Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction
7. Demonstrating Understanding of the School and Community Context, Including the Instructional Implications of Cultural/Linguistic, Socioeconomic, and Political Factors
8. Communicating Schoolwide Outcomes Data and Improvement Goals to the School Community

### **C. School Improvement Leadership**

9. Working With Others to Identify Student and School Needs and Developing an Improvement Plan Based on Student and other Outcomes Data
10. Implementing Change Strategies Based on Current, Relevant Theories of School Improvement
11. Identifying and Using Available Resources to Implement the School Improvement Plan
12. Instituting a Collaborative, Ongoing Process of Monitoring and Revising the Improvement Plan Based on Student Outcomes

### **D. Professional Development Leadership**

13. Modeling Life-Long Learning and Job-Related Professional Growth
14. Helping Teachers Improve Their Individual Professional Practice Through Professional Growth Activities
15. Identifying and Facilitating a Variety of Professional Growth Opportunities for Faculty, Staff, Parents, and Other Members of the School Community

### **E. Organizational and Systems Leadership**

16. Implementing California School Laws, Guidelines, and Other Relevant Federal, State, and Local Requirements and Regulations
17. Developing, Implementing and Monitoring the School's Budget



18. Understanding and Managing the Complex Interaction of All of the School's Systems to Promote Teaching and Learning

#### **F. Community Leadership**

19. Representing and Promoting the School's Accomplishments and Needs to the LEA and the Public
20. Involving the Community in Helping Achieve the School's Vision and Goals

#### ***Further Explication of the CAPEs***

Similar to the summary overview narrative of expected competencies provided for each TPE, each CAPE is further explicated by a concise narrative expanding the description of the related expected performance competencies of candidates. Although this aspect of the work is still currently under development, a sample set of draft narratives for CAPEs 5-8 within Category B, Instructional Leadership, is provided for reference. The draft sample expanded narratives for the four CAPEs in Category B are provided in Appendix A.

#### **Part II: Draft Administrator Content Expectations**

The ASC Standards Writing Team reviewed the current Commission-approved administrator content expectations, current research and publications by WestEd, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National Council Accreditation on Teacher Education (NCATE) and used those as a foundational basis for suggesting revisions and/or updates to develop a comprehensive set of administrator content expectations aligned with the new CAPEs. The draft Content Expectations describe the foundational knowledge basis that administrative services candidates would need to have and to apply in the job context of a school administrator to meet the performance expectations exemplified in the CAPEs.

Appendix B contains the draft Administrator Content Expectations along with the draft CAPEs to which they are aligned. Once adopted by the Commission, the Administrator Content Expectations will form the basis for the content preparation component of preliminary administrative services credential programs. They will also be incorporated into the Preliminary Administrative Services Program Standards currently being developed by the ASC Standards Writing Team. Should the Commission choose in the future to develop a content examination as a companion examination to the candidate performance assessment, the Content Expectations would form the content on which that examination development process would be based.

#### ***Next Steps for CAPEs and Content Expectations***

Following Commission review of the draft Content Expectations, and subsequent to Commission direction to proceed to a field review of the CAPEs and the Content Expectations, field surveys would be developed and made available to stakeholders. The following are samples typical of the types of questions that would be asked on field surveys of this nature:

- How important are the knowledge, skills, or abilities addressed by this competency for performing the job of a California public school administrator?
- How well does the set of descriptive statements represent important examples of the knowledge, skills, and abilities addressed by the competency?

- To what extent does the set of statements, as a whole, reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are needed for effective job performance by a California public school administrator?
- To what extent does this set of knowledge, skills, and abilities reflect those needed by a beginning school administrator?

### **Part III: Options for the Development of the Administrator Performance Assessment (APA)**

As indicated above, in December 2012 the Commission took action to begin development of an Administrator Performance Assessment (APA) to serve as the statutorily-permitted expedited examination route to the preliminary administrative services credential when the current examination contract for this purpose expires in October 2014 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-12/2012-12-4E.pdf>).

As a state agency, the Commission is subject to the requirements established under the *State Contracting Manual* when it seeks a contractor or an external agency to develop new assessments (<http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/ols/SCM%202012/SCM%20Nov%202012%20Complete.pdf>). The *Contracting Manual* specifies several types of contractual options potentially available to the Commission.

#### **Development Option A: Public Bid Process**

The most commonly used option is that of an open, public bidding process to obtain a contractor capable of providing the needed services; in this case, development of a valid and reliable licensure assessment. As noted in Section 2.03 of the *Manual*, “Services obtained from the private sector are typically subject to a competitive selection process.”

Historically, new Commission examinations have typically been developed through an open bid process conducted according to regulations specified in Sections 2 and 3 of the *State Contracting Manual*. In accordance with these regulations, the Commission typically develops and issues a Request for Proposals (RFP), a document that includes, among other contents, the purpose of the work to be performed by the contractor, a detailed scope of work, directions to bidders for responding to the scope of work, contractual information and requirements, proposal submission and organization requirements, corporate capability information requirements, and scoring criteria. The Executive Director releases the RFP in compliance with public notice requirements as outlined in the *Manual*. The text of the RFP has typically not been reviewed by the Commission prior to release since the Commission reviews and approves the specifications for the work to be done which are then incorporated within the text of the actual RFP.

Respondents to the RFP address the Commission’s work scope and related requirements, and may propose additional and/or optional enhancements for the Commission’s consideration if allowed by the framework of the RFP issued by the Commission. Respondents also propose a budget for their work, along with proposed fees for administering the assessment. The contractor that develops the assessment typically administers the assessment because of the proprietary nature of the assessment development and scoring processes. It is usually not possible to separate the two activities of development and administration for this reason.

Examples of Commission examinations developed through the competitive bid process include the CBEST and the RICA examinations.

It should be noted that examinations development and administration work relating to the Commission's examination programs is highly complex, and requires that a bidder have not only the extensive psychometric expertise to develop and validate licensing examinations that will stand up to standards of legal defensibility, but also the technical and facilities capacity to administer what may well be the largest licensing examination of its kind in the world. There are very few companies in the nation with this type of capacity, and typically the Commission will receive only one or two bids in response to an examinations-related RFP. The California Public Contract Code recognizes the difficulty inherent in letting examinations-related contracts and in response has exempted "contracts for the development, maintenance, administration, or use of licensing or proficiency testing examinations" from the requirement to have three competitive bids or proposals for each contract (PUC 10340 (b)(7)). The Commission makes every attempt to ensure a competitive process and has used the RFP process on the majority of its examination contracts.

#### **Development Option B: Interagency Agreements**

According to Government Code §11256, an interagency agreement (I/A) is defined as a contract between two or more California State agencies. A contract with a California State University campus is treated as an I/A. A contract with a University of California campus or Regents (UC) may be treated as either an I/A or a standard agreement, but the contract must use the required terms for whichever type of contract is used. It is important to note that interagency agreements may not be used for contracts with campus foundations, the federal government, local entities, Joint Powers Authorities (JPA), or other states.

Special provisions apply to Interagency Agreements: I/As are exempt from advertising in the *California State Contracts Register* (CSCR) and are also exempt from competitive bidding. Note: If the entity performing the service is using subcontracts or purchasing goods, those services and goods should be incidental and typically should be competitively bid. Both parties to the I/A must follow State laws and State contracting requirements.

To date, no Commission licensure examinations have been developed through an Interagency Agreement. However, other states have entered into agreements with California to use California-developed and owned examinations such as the CBEST and the CSET: American Sign Language examinations.

#### **Development Option C: Contracts with Other Governmental Entities and Public Universities**

Government entities/auxiliaries are exempt from competitive bidding. Agreements for services and consultant services do not require competitive bids or proposals if the contract is with:

1. A California State agency, State college or State university;
2. A state agency, state college or state university from another state;
3. A local governmental entity or agency, including those created as a Joint Powers Authority (JPA);
4. An auxiliary organization of the CSU, or a California community college;

5. The Federal Government;
6. A foundation organized to support the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges; or
7. An auxiliary organization of the Student Aid Commission established under Education Code §69522.

Under this option, administrative overhead fees must be “reasonable” and the Commission could only pay overhead charges on the first \$25,000 for each subcontract. These overhead limitations may be waived when contracts are with the Federal government and cost recovery requirements result in higher published rates. The overhead may not exceed the published rates.

To date, the Commission has used federal funds in the earlier development and validation of the CalTPA model since at the time the Commission had a competitive federal Title II Teacher Quality State Grant for this and other related purposes. This process could be used, for example, if the Commission were to want to use an existing licensure examination already developed and validated by another state and available for use in California. Using an examination developed by another state or entity, however, would also raise issues of alignment with California standards and requirements, faculty training, candidate preparation for the assessment, administration of the assessment, and scoring and reporting of the assessment results. In addition, there could potentially be fees or related costs charged by the owner of the examination.

This process could also potentially be used if the Commission were to want to contract with a California State University campus, for example, to develop a licensure assessment. A key issue, however, that may arise with a contract for examinations development for licensure purposes with another California state entity is the issue of the contractor entity’s capability and capacity to not only develop and validate, but also to administer and score the statewide assessment initially and over time for all candidates, and provide initial and ongoing appropriate data to candidates and the Commission for a variety of purposes and uses.

#### ***An Important Further Consideration Regarding Development Options B and C***

The *Contracting Manual* clearly specifies that “**No subcontracting process may be used to circumvent competitive bidding:** Services to be provided by entities listed above are to be performed *primarily with the staff of the public entity* or, in the case of the educational institutions, auxiliaries or foundations, by the faculty, staff or students associated with the particular educational institution. *Agreements with entities listed in section A are not to be used by State agencies to circumvent the State’s competitive bidding or other contracting requirements.* (PCC §10340.)”

There are also significant limits on subcontracting within Option C. The *Contracting Manual* indicates in Section 3.06 that “Services may be subcontracted without limitation only when the subcontracting is justified and not for the purpose of circumventing state contracting requirements” and that... “This section is intended to limit, not increase, the amount of subcontracting if any in public entity contracts. It is not intended to create a basis for using public entity contracts to procure third-party services or goods for state agencies. It is intended to allow some limited subcontracting on an exceptional basis, under appropriate documented

circumstances, where the subcontract is integral to the work being performed under contract with the public entity and the contract work is performed primarily by staff of the public entity. “

### **Development Option D: Contract with Nonprofit Organizations**

According to Section 3.15 of the *Contracting Manual*, “Contracts may be made between the State and a private entity that is a nonprofit corporation. (Int. Rev. Code § 501(c).) Bidding requirements would apply unless exempt by statute or the contract is for subvention or local assistance.” If the Commission were to want to contract with a nonprofit organization for purposes of licensure examination development, then the open public bidding process would need to be followed.

### ***Commission and Stakeholder Roles in the Examination Development Process***

The primary purpose of each of the Commission’s examinations is to ensure that candidates have the required knowledge, skills, and abilities to assure effective performance of the job roles authorized by their credential. To that end, if the Commission chooses to develop its own examination rather than use an “off the shelf examination” (i.e., an examination previously developed and validated by another entity), each stage of the development process for Commission-developed examinations includes input from K–16 California educators regarding what both educators and students need to know to be successful. The inclusiveness of this process in involving California educators is a unique feature of Commission-developed examinations, and ensures that these examinations meet California’s needs and expectations.

The process of developing and implementing a Commission-owned examination is complex, but follows a standardized, rigorous set of procedures to assure the validity, reliability and legal defensibility of the examination. The development process and associated activities are typically facilitated through the assistance of an external contractor. The content specifications, test questions, and related test materials developed under the contract are owned by the Commission during and after the development process.

There are four major phases in the development of a Commission-owned examination.

**Phase One: Establishing the Examination Content Expert Panel.** To assure that the content of the new examination reflects California standards and expectations, the Commission advertises for applications and nominations for experts in the particular content area. These experts will constitute the examination’s Content Expert Panel. Applications are received and reviewed blind (i.e., with names and other identifying information removed from the application) by staff using a rating rubric to assure that only the most qualified applicants are considered for appointment to the panel.

The names of the most qualified individuals identified through this rigorous screening and evaluation process are forwarded to the Executive Director for review and appointment. In the case of the Administrator Performance Assessment, the current Administrative Services Standards Writing workgroup is serving the role and function of the content expert panel.

**Phase Two: Defining the Content for the Examination.** The work of the panel begins with the identification and review of the most current California K–12 standards and other standards,

frameworks, advisories, literature and research in the content area of the examination. Through reviews of these guiding documents, the Content Expert Panel drafts content specifications that define the content eligible to be assessed by the examination. This work has already been accomplished by the Administrative Standards writing group and was presented earlier in this agenda item.

After the draft of the content specifications has been reviewed by the panel and by the Bias Review Committee, a statewide content validation survey is developed and implemented to collect data on the importance and comprehensiveness of each competency of the content specifications, also as described above.

In the meanwhile, panel members work on establishing the recommended test structure (i.e., subtests, if any, and the types of questions that would best match the particular content). An agenda item is presented to the Commission for review and approval of the content specifications, and the contractor begins to draft test questions for review by the Bias Review Committee and Content Expert Panel.

**Phase Three: Developing Test Questions.** Draft test questions are first reviewed by the Bias Review Committee and then by the Content Expert Panel. Test questions are then revised as approved by the panel and field tested. Field-test results, including the performance of individual test questions, are provided to the panel for finalizing the test questions. Any modifications to questions are also reviewed by the Bias Review Committee.

**Phase Four: Setting Passing Scores.** After the first operational administration of the examination, a different group of experts is appointed by the Executive Director through an open application, nomination and review process to serve as a standard-setting panel to recommend passing scores for the examination. This panel will also include one or two liaison members from the original Content Expert Panel that worked on the development of the examination.

An agenda item with the recommended passing score for the examination is presented by staff to the Commission for approval. After the passing score is approved by the Commission, the candidates who took the initial administration are notified as to their passing status, and the passing standard is made public.

Once this entire process has been completed, the examination is then ready for ongoing use with candidates. From beginning to end, the process of developing and implementing a new examination in general can take approximately a year and a half to two and a half years, depending on the scope and complexity of the specific examination. For the Commission to maintain viable and legally defensible examinations, the content of these examinations must be periodically reviewed as part of a validity study that ensures that the examination reflects the most current California K–12 or other applicable standards, frameworks, and relevant documents.

In accordance with the Education Code, the development and implementation of Commission-owned examinations are funded by candidate fees. The Education Code gives the Commission the authority to charge candidate fees for each examination to support the oversight,

development, validity and other requested studies, registration, administration, scoring, score reporting, and program maintenance for these examinations. For example, EC §44253.8 requires the Commission to “charge examination fees that are sufficient to recover the costs of development and administering the examination, including the costs of periodic studies of the examinations, except to the extent that these costs are recovered by appropriation by another source of funds.”

An exception to this process is the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA), for which the Commission has paid the development costs to the contractor and for which no fees are charged by the Commission to candidates since the assessment is administered to candidates by each local teacher preparation program rather than by the Commission.

### **Types of Contracts Resulting from the Bidding Process**

Whether a bidding process has been competitive or non-competitive in nature, if a contract is awarded through a bidding process the contract may be of two different types. One is the *revenue-only contract*, and the other is the *fee for service contract*. In a revenue-only contract, sometimes referred to as a “no-cost contract,” the bidder assumes all of the costs of carrying out the scope of work outlined in the contract, and collects the total candidate fees, minus the Commission’s portion representing the management fee, as full payment for the work. In this type of contract, the Commission does not expend any funds on the contract or on any work done by a contractor pursuant to the contract. A revenue-only contract is often used for examinations development and administration, since the scope of work tends to be extensive and costly in nature.

In a fee for service contract, the Commission outlines a scope of work that is to be done by the contractor and the contractor is paid directly by the Commission for that work. This type of contract may typically be used for a smaller scope of work that needs to be done to meet a specific need that has arisen outside of the scope of any of the Commission’s existing contracts.

Regardless of the contract’s funding option, the Commission specifies the scope of work to be done, has approval over the development and administration processes specified within the contract, and sets the contract terms through the design and drafting of the actual performance contract. In other words, within both the revenue-only and the fee for service options, the Commission retains control as to how the development process occurs and monitors the fidelity of the development and implementation processes as specified within the contract signed by the Commission and the contractor. All of the contractor’s work is overseen directly by Commission staff, and any potential modifications or changes must be approved by the Commission or its staff, depending on the nature of the potential change.

Within both funding options, the lump sum examination registration fee paid by the candidate to the contractor is actually comprised of two parts: the portion paid to the contractor and the portion representing the Commission management fee. The contractor submits to the Commission that part of the registration fee paid by the candidate that constitutes the Commission management fee, which is deposited into the Test Development and Administration Account and may be used according to EC §44235.1(c) for examinations-related purposes, including “...the development, agency-support, maintenance, or administration of tests or other

assessments established, required, or administered by the commission.” The Commission sets the management fee for each examination on an annual basis.

Examples of Commission examinations funded through a revenue-only contract include the CSET examination series and the RICA; examples of Commission examinations funded through the fee for service contract include the CalTPA and the six less commonly taught CSET world languages examinations developed pursuant to legislation (i.e., Arabic, Farsi, Khmer, and several other languages).

The continued approval by the Department of General Services for the Commission to conduct its own contracting process is testament to the Commission’s consistent track record with respect to meeting all state requirements for conducting its bidding processes and contracts awards. In accordance with Commission policy, staff will continue to bring agenda items forward to the Commission for all examination bid processes resulting in a contract award of over \$150,000.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff requests that the Commission:

- Review the current draft structure of the CAPEs, including whether the proposed categories meet Commission expectations and whether the categories reflect the Commission’s relative priority order for this set of performance expectations for purposes of examination development
- Review the draft Content Expectations
- Indicate if the draft CAPEs and/or the draft Content Specifications should proceed to a field review, with or without suggested modifications based on Commission input
- Discuss and if appropriate, indicate which development option for the Administrator Performance Assessment the Commission would like staff to pursue

### **Next Steps**

If the Commission is satisfied with the draft CAPEs, with or without modifications indicated as a result of the Commission’s discussion, and if the Commission is satisfied with the draft Content Expectations, also with or without modifications indicated as a result of the Commission’s discussion, the next steps would be to complete the development of the narrative statements explicating all of the CAPEs and then conduct field reviews for validation of the CAPEs and the Content Expectations.

Depending on the development option identified by the Commission for development and administration of the new Administrator Performance Assessment, staff would begin the appropriate implementation process.



## **Appendix A**

### ***Draft Narrative Statements*** **for** **CATEGORY B: Instructional Leadership**

#### **CAPE 5: Promoting Implementation of K-12 Standards and Pedagogical Skills for Content Instruction**

The principal is knowledgeable and articulate about all of the K-12 student academic content standards and the appropriate pedagogical skills for teaching the content of the standards to K-12 students. As the instructional leader of the school, the principal promotes the use of the K-12 standards as the primary basis for classroom instruction and for student assessments. The principal helps teachers, students, parents, and community members understand the K-12 standards and their relationship to accomplishing the school's vision and goals. The principal understands and can articulate principles of effective lesson planning, appropriate student assessment processes, and appropriate classroom assessment administration practices for K-12 students. The principal is also knowledgeable about the state's student assessment program and can explain the assessment program and its intended outcomes to staff, students, parents and the community. The principal identifies and takes action to mitigate potential and actual barriers to student learning.

#### **CAPE 6: Evaluating, Analyzing, and Providing Feedback on the Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction**

The principal uses his/her knowledge of the K-12 student academic content standards and appropriate instructional practices to observe and evaluate classroom planning and instruction in accordance with LEA policy and practices. As part of the evaluation process, the principal analyzes evidence of teacher effectiveness based on student work and student learning outcomes. The principal communicates evaluative feedback effectively, equitably, and on a timely basis to help teachers improve instructional practices. The principal models self-reflection and use of evidence to help teachers develop these skills and practices as part of their daily planning, instruction, and assessment activities with students. The principal uses his/her knowledge of available instructional resources to help provide support for improvements in teaching and learning based on teacher and student needs.

#### **CAPE 7: Demonstrating Understanding of the School and Community Context, Including the Instructional Implications of Cultural/Linguistic, Socioeconomic, and Political Factors**

The principal understands the demographics of the school community, including socioeconomic context, students and family characteristics, cultural and linguistic diversity, and political issues and uses this knowledge to help improve teaching and learning. The principal is knowledgeable about appropriate instructional practices to meet the needs of a wide variety of learners, including but not limited to English learner students, students with special needs, and others. The principal helps teachers and staff access community resources, including parents and other community members, to promote learning about students and families, and to promote culturally and linguistically inclusive instructional practices. The principal helps teachers, staff,

and others understand the political factors within the community that may affect the school's instructional program, and is proactive in providing information about the schools, its needs and accomplishments, within the larger political environment.

**CAPE 8: Communicating Schoolwide Outcomes Data and Improvement Goals to the School Community**

The principal communicates the school's improvement goals to students, teachers, parents, and the community. The principal identifies appropriate sources of data that can provide information about the school's progress in achieving its goals. The principal organizes data relating to achieving schoolwide goals and outcomes in a manner understandable to students, teachers, parents and the community, and analyzes the data to indicate the degree of progress being made towards the school's goals. The principal presents and discusses these data, including but not limited to standardized achievement data, classroom and other local assessments, with all members of the school community. The principal helps all members of the school community articulate revised school improvement goals based on continuous data analysis and reporting.

## Appendix B

### *DRAFT* California Administrator Content Expectations

January 2013

<b>A. Visionary Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
1. Developing and Articulating a Vision of Teaching and Learning for the School Consistent With the Local Education Agency's Overall Vision and Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Major theories and concepts in educational leadership</li><li>• Relationships between leadership theory and practice in the context of contemporary educational issues in California</li><li>• Viewing educational leadership through the lens of student learning</li><li>• Skills and strategies for facilitating the development of a shared vision with and across multiple constituencies</li><li>• Components and characteristics of a sound and sustainable school vision, including applying data from multiple measures of student learning to developing a vision of teaching and learning for all students</li></ul>
2. Developing a Shared Commitment to the Vision Among All Members of the School Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Aligning the school vision with the LEA's vision and goals</li><li>• Identifying and understanding the political, social, economic, and cultural contexts of education at the local, regional, state, and federal levels that affect California public schools and how to respond to and influence these contexts</li><li>• Public school governance in California, including the structure and organization of public schooling and the roles and responsibilities of various individuals and system components</li></ul>
3. Leading by Example to Promote Implementation of the Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The relationships between federal, state, and local educational policies and practices and the role of specified policies and practices in ensuring equitable, democratic public education</li><li>• Examining and responding to equity issues related to race, diversity, and access, using inclusive practices</li></ul>
4. Sharing Leadership with Others in the School Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifying potential barriers to accomplishing a vision and effective ways to address and overcome barriers</li><li>• Shaping school programs, plans, and activities to ensure that they are integrated, articulated through the grades, and consistent with the vision</li></ul>

<b>A. Visionary Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
to Help Accomplish the Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitating the comprehensive integration of technology to support achievement of the vision</li> <li>• Communicating about, modeling, and holding oneself and others accountable for exhibiting personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness</li> <li>• Skills and strategies for leveraging and marshaling sufficient resources to implement and attain the vision for all student groups</li> <li>• The importance of communicating information about the school on a regular and predictable basis to all families through a variety of media, and ensuring that all constituents have ample access to information sources</li> <li>• Effective, professional, and interactive communication with various audiences and for various educational purposes</li> </ul>

<b>B. Instructional Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
5. Promoting Implementation of K-12 Standards, Pedagogical Skills, and Student Assessments for Content Instruction  6. Evaluating, Analyzing, and Providing Feedback on the Effectiveness of Classroom Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding how to advocate, nurture, and sustain a positive culture of learning that emphasizes high expectations and an instructional program that promotes success for all student groups.</li> <li>• California's K-12 student academic content standards and state-adopted assessment systems for measuring student performance</li> <li>• K-12 standards-based curricula and of adopted/articulated instructional programs and materials throughout the grades and/or content areas</li> <li>• Teacher observation and evaluation systems grounded in standards-based teaching and learning</li> <li>• Appropriate and "best" instructional practices for all learners, including English learners and students with special needs</li> <li>• Types of evidence need to support making evidence-based decisions regarding instructional improvement, including changes in practice</li> <li>• Analysis techniques for analyzing, evaluating, and using various types of data to engage staff in looking at their instructional effectiveness</li> <li>• Methods/approaches to providing constructive feedback to teachers based on classroom observations</li> </ul>

<b>B. Instructional Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
<p>7. Demonstrating Understanding of the School and Community Context, Including the Instructional Implications of Cultural/Linguistic, Socioeconomic, and Political Factors</p> <p>8. Communicating Schoolwide Outcomes Data and Improvement Goals to the School Community</p>	<p>and analysis of student work and/or assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Psychometrically valid processes for developing appropriate and effective classroom assessments as one source of multiple data about teacher effectiveness and student learning</li> <li>• Understanding the purpose and role of multiple assessments to continuously evaluate student learning</li> <li>• Barriers to learning such as discriminatory practices, personal and institutional bias and steps to minimize or eliminate these barriers</li> <li>• Skills and strategies for engaging all parents/guardians in the instructional program and in behavior management systems in ways that support high expectations</li> <li>• Principles of adult learning and their use in designing, facilitating, and implementing effective, motivating, and data-driven professional development programs and opportunities that focus on authentic problems and student outcomes</li> <li>• Induction programs for beginning teachers, including BTSA</li> <li>• Induction methods such as mentoring, coaching, observation, and feedback, to promote effective teaching and improve performance for all faculty and staff</li> <li>• Effective uses of data to assess and diagnose instructional needs, define staff goals for continuous improvement, and collaboratively design differentiated professional development to meet needs and achieve goals</li> <li>• Strategies for building staff capacity through systems of support and development, integrating opportunities for continuous learning into the educational environment, and engaging faculty and staff in ongoing reflection and self-assessment</li> <li>• Effective uses of staff time for purposes of professional development for both individual and school purposes and goals</li> <li>• Strategies for self-improvement and planning for continuous learning in order to serve as a role model for others</li> <li>• Classroom structures, schedules, instructional materials, and grouping practices that support teaching and learning goals and that facilitate active learning and promote student reflection and inquiry</li> <li>• How to create a dynamic learning environment that appropriately integrates technology to facilitate student learning, creativity, and collaboration</li> <li>• Policies and practices for determining student learning needs, placing students in appropriate learning</li> </ul>

<b>B. Instructional Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
	<p>contexts, and ensuring full access to the curriculum for all students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding and maximizing the relationships between student behavior management systems and student success</li> <li>• How to develop and implement positive and equitable behavior management systems that promote and support a collaborative, positive culture of learning</li> <li>• How to establish a culture of individual and collective accountability among students, teachers, and other staff by developing and implementing an accountability system grounded in standards-based teaching and learning</li> <li>• How to use the influence and power inherent in a leadership position to enhance the educational program, promote learning for all student groups, and make fair and appropriate decisions</li> <li>• Strategies for creating a positive, safe, and supportive learning environment for all student groups by promoting equity and respect among all members of the school community</li> <li>• Principles of educational equity and diversity, and how to provide equitable access to the school, the curriculum, and available programmatic supports to all groups of students and their parents/guardians</li> <li>• Identifying and recognizing discriminatory practices in education and how to identify, analyze, minimize, and eliminate potential personal and institutional bias</li> </ul>

<b>C. School Improvement Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
9. Working With Others to Identify Student and School Needs and Developing an Improvement Plan Based on Student and Other Outcomes Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theories and strategies for instituting, managing, and evaluating a school change process</li> <li>• Theories and strategies for involving multiple constituencies in identifying student and school needs</li> <li>• Strategies for involving multiple constituencies in sharing and using data to assess and diagnose instructional needs, define student, staff, and community goals for continuous improvement, problem solve, and collaboratively design a school improvement plan consistent with the school's vision and goals</li> </ul>
10. Implementing Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicating the school improvement plan to a wide variety of constituents</li> <li>• Strategies for building staff capacity to bring about school improvement through implementing</li> </ul>

<b>C. School Improvement Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
<p>Strategies Based on Current, Relevant Theories of School Improvement</p> <p>11. Identifying and Using Available Resources to Implement the School Improvement Plan</p> <p>12. Instituting a Collaborative, Ongoing Process of Monitoring and Revising the Improvement Plan Based on Student Outcomes</p>	<p>systems of support and development, integrating opportunities for continuous learning into the educational environment, and engaging faculty and staff in ongoing reflection and self-assessment relative to student outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies for building community capacity to bring about school improvement through involving the community in school improvement activities and engaging with the community in ongoing reflection relative to student outcomes</li> <li>• Using time and technology effectively to help manage the school improvement process</li> <li>• How to coordinate the identification, acquisition, and use of internal and external resources to provide support for implementing the school improvement plan</li> <li>• Strategies for continuous progress monitoring of the school's improvement plan and outcomes, and for using those data for updating the school improvement plan as needed</li> </ul>

<b>D. Professional Development Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
<p>13. Modeling Life-Long Learning and Job-Related Professional Growth</p> <p>14. Helping Teachers Improve Their Individual Professional Practice Through Professional Growth Activities</p> <p>15. Identifying and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principles of adult learning and their use in designing, facilitating, and implementing effective, motivating, and data-driven professional development programs and opportunities that focus on authentic problems and on improving student outcomes</li> <li>• Skills and strategies for providing opportunities for all staff to develop and use skills for collaboration, distributed leadership, reflection, shared decision making, and problem solving in support of student learning and for inspiring higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation</li> <li>• Modeling self-improvement and related professional growth activities, and demonstrating monitoring of improvement in one's own performance</li> <li>• Understanding how to use professional development for faculty, staff, and self to promote lifelong</li> </ul>

<b>D. Professional Development Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
Facilitating a Variety of Professional Growth Opportunities for Faculty, Staff, Parents, and Other Members of the School Community	<p>learning and the success of all student groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to implement effective induction plans for new teachers and use a variety of methods, such as mentoring, coaching, observation, and feedback, to promote effective teaching and improve performance for all faculty and staff</li> <li>• How to use data to assess and diagnose instructional needs, define staff goals for continuous improvement, and collaboratively design differentiated professional development to meet needs and achieve goals</li> <li>• Strategies for building staff capacity through systems of support and development, integrating opportunities for continuous learning into the educational environment, and engaging faculty and staff in ongoing reflection and self-assessment</li> <li>• Modeling how to develop and implement a plan for self-improvement and continuous learning; use various types of activities and resources to engage in effective professional development; and reflect on personal leadership practices and their influence on others</li> <li>• How to use time and technology effectively to improve instructional leadership and promote personal and professional growth</li> <li>• How to support, motivate, recognize, and celebrate staff at various stages in career development</li> <li>• Strategies and opportunities to involve parents and the community in identifying and providing targeted professional and personal growth activities to support student achievement as well as increase adults' knowledge and skills</li> </ul>

<b>E. Organizational and Systems Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
16. Implementing California School Laws, Guidelines, and Other Relevant Federal, State, and Local Requirements and Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and guidelines relating to public schools and the educational process</li> <li>• School finance in California, including relevant laws and regulations (e.g., state and local revenue sources, capital and operational funding, federal funding)</li> <li>• Understanding constitutional rights and protections for students and staff (e.g., due process, equal access, free speech, harassment) in various educational contexts and the role of the educational</li> </ul>



## E. Organizational and Systems Leadership

CAPEs	Expected Content Knowledge
<p>17. Developing, Implementing and Monitoring the School's Budget</p> <p>18. Understanding and Managing the Complex Interaction of All of the School's Systems to Promote Teaching and Learning</p>	<p>administrator in monitoring and ensuring compliance with these rights and protections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding legal issues and responsibilities related to an evolving technological culture (e.g., ensuring equitable access to digital tools and resources to meet all students' needs, implementing policies for the safe and appropriate use of information technology, promoting responsible use of technology)</li> <li>• Understanding how district policies and specific laws (e.g., related to students with disabilities, English learners, parents/guardians, mandated reporting, confidentiality, liability) at the federal, state, and local levels affect individuals and schools, and how to ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of applicable laws, policies, regulations, and requirements</li> <li>• Understanding, developing, and monitoring the school's budget and expenditures, including involving stakeholders in budgeting processes and procedures for communicating and reporting accurate financial information to a variety of audiences (e.g., school boards, community members)</li> <li>• Prioritizing use of school resources, including the budget, to support the school's vision, goals, and improvement plan</li> <li>• Research-based strategies and best practices for establishing, monitoring, and evaluating organizational structures, processes, and systems that promote a culture of collaboration and respect and that maintain a focus on continuous improvement and enhanced achievement for all student groups</li> <li>• How to apply systems thinking to set priorities and manage organizational complexity</li> <li>• Principles and procedures for evaluating and using technology to facilitate effective and timely communication, manage information, enhance collaboration, and support effective management of the organization</li> <li>• Effective, legal, equitable, and ethical procedures for recruiting, selecting, hiring, inducting, developing, and retaining staff</li> <li>• Effective, legal, equitable, and ethical procedures for evaluating, supervising, disciplining, and dismissing staff</li> <li>• Skills and strategies for coordinating and aligning human resources, including making appropriate staffing and teacher placement decisions, to support organizational goals and promote equitable learning opportunities for all student groups</li> <li>• Understanding processes of labor relations and collective bargaining as they relate to education in</li> </ul>

<b>E. Organizational and Systems Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
	<p>California, and contract implementation and management within the local setting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and ensure privacy and confidentiality for all students and staff, including using appropriate technological tools</li> <li>• Practices and procedures (e.g., record keeping, repair and maintenance, custodial services) and legal requirements (e.g., fire safety codes, OSHA regulations, Civic Center Act) for sustaining a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment</li> <li>• Legal and policy requirements related to school safety and how to develop and implement district and school plans and procedures for ensuring student and staff safety and building security, including principles and practices related to crisis planning and emergency management</li> <li>• Effective and equitably applied student behavior management principles and practices, including tiered disciplinary measures, that promote a safe and productive learning environment for all students</li> <li>• Strategies for allocating and utilizing space to meet instructional needs and accommodate extended learning programs (e.g., intervention programs, before/after-school programs, summer school programs, volunteer programs)</li> <li>• Use of technological systems and tools to support the management of school operations</li> <li>• Procedures, practices, and legal requirements for managing auxiliary services (e.g., federal and state regulations related to food services, health services, student transportation, free and reduced-price meals)</li> <li>• How to use planning and problem solving to allocate fiscal and material resources effectively, legally, equitably, ethically, and in ways that align with teaching and learning goals for all student groups</li> <li>• Types of financial records, procedures for accurate record keeping and reporting, including legal requirements, and the use of current technologies for financial management and business procedures</li> <li>• Strategies for responding effectively to the unpredictable circumstances or unintended consequences of decisions and/or school events</li> </ul>

<b>F. Community Leadership</b>	
<b>CAPEs</b>	<b>Expected Content Knowledge</b>
<p>19. Representing and Promoting the School's Accomplishments and Needs to the LEA and the Public</p> <p>20. Involving the Community in Helping Achieve the School's Vision and Goals</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defining the “school community”</li> <li>• Understanding the multiple connections between school, families, and the community</li> <li>• Skills and strategies for effectively communicating the shared vision, helping all stakeholders understand the vision, and encouraging the entire school community to work toward achieving the vision</li> <li>• Strategies for developing, nurturing, mobilizing and leveraging community support for the school, its programs and activities to promote equity and success for all student groups</li> <li>• How to learn about and address the diverse expectations, needs, goals, and aspirations of family and community groups and incorporate this knowledge as a basis for decision making</li> <li>• Skills and strategies for trust building, team building, consensus building, and conflict resolution and for promoting a sense of shared responsibility among all members of the educational community</li> <li>• Strategies for addressing the concerns of stakeholders who may find change threatening and to overcome barriers to change</li> <li>• Strategies for reaching out to the broader community, including families, agencies, and community organizations, to promote organizational improvement</li> <li>• Public speaking and presentation skills</li> <li>• Expository, persuasive, and narrative writing skills</li> </ul>

## **Appendix C**

### **Administrative Services Standards Writing Team**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Mike Bossi	Director of Leadership Coaching, Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Danette Brown	Teacher on Special Assignment, La Habra City Schools
Rebecca Cheung	Academic Coordinator, Principal Leadership Institute, UC Berkeley
Steve Davis	Faculty Member in Doctoral Studies, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Karen Kearney	Director, Leadership Initiative, West Ed
Carol Leighty	Interim Dean, Point Loma Nazarene University Superintendent, Temecula Valley Unified School District (retired)
Carlye Olsen	Director of Accountability, Professional Development, Educational Technology, Curriculum and Instructional Materials, Whittier Union High School District
Olivia Sosa	Director, Multilingual Education, San Joaquin County Office of Education